

JAMES EDWARD BECKMANN, a Non-Commercial Business registered with the State of Oregon
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE Corporation Division with Certified Copy 287Y988a4
and a registry number of 1315372-92

Non-Domestic Mail

In care of: 2500 East Second Street

Newberg, Oregon

ZIP CODE EXEMPT

Served By Registered Mail

RE 535 035 088 US

United States District Court
District of Oregon

FILED 14 NOV '17 11:07 USDC-ORP

FATHERS & DAUGHTERS NEVADA, LLC,
I AM WRATH PRODUCTION, INC, and
SEPTEMBER PRODUCTIONS, INC.,
Plaintiffs

v.

JAMES EDWARD BECKMANN
Defendant

(
(
(
(
(
(
(

Case No.: 3:16-cv-01645-SI

NOTICE OF VOID JUDGMENT

NOTICE ON AND FOR THE RECORD

Notice of Void Judgment

JAMES EDWARD BECKMANN, a Non-Commercial Business formed on April 17, 2017 and registered with the State of Oregon OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE Corporation Division with Certified Copy 287Y988a4 and a registry number of 1315372-92; The Business' Authorized Representative, I, Me, or Myself, also known as James Edward Beckmann a sovereign, a private person, living soul, a man living upon the land, a judicial power Citizen by right of blood, without the corporation called UNITED STATES, do hereby provide Notice of Void Judgment of all Motions by the Plaintiffs or their counsel, by Declaration, as follows;

- 1 All Motions shall remain void until the Plaintiffs or their counsel can prove by evidence on the record that they have standing and the following points that they do not have standing are false:
 - a. The Plaintiffs and their Counsel are conducting their activities and seeking to settle charges amongst the people in the public and they have failed to file on the record the payment and performance bonds which provide indemnity in the event of any missteps which may cause damage to the public are required for standing.
 - b. The Plaintiff's counsel has failed to file his representation contract/power of Attorney, using His proper name, with the client, for the record, to establish His authority and legal relationship with the Plaintiffs; thus, He has no standing.
 - c. There must be causal connection between the injury and the conduct complained of, so that the injury is fairly traceable to the challenged action of the defendant and not the result of the independent action of some third party; who is not before the court. In this case the injury occurred before the Business was formed, with an open internet site, and no verified eyewitness; there is no traceability to the Defendant; therefore, the Plaintiffs have no standing.
 - d. The Plaintiff's counsel has taken His Oath of Office using the pseudonym Carl D. Crowell, which is not His proper name; thus, He has committed indirect contempt of court in every Act, Motion, and signature presented to the court in this case; He has no standing as an attorney at Law; and He has left the Plaintiffs without proper representation or standing.
 - e. Since the Plaintiffs are not going to be testifying as witnesses under oath with firsthand knowledge and information related to their claim, so we are not operating in equity; furthermore, the Plaintiffs cannot produce a contract with the Business' authorized representatives "wet-ink" signature which they want to hold the defendant accountable to either; therefore, the Plaintiffs have no standing in equity or law.



- 2 **All Motions shall remain void until** the following point which show the Court does not have subject matter jurisdiction is disproven:
 - a) This Business objects to the evidence supporting the Plaintiffs claim because it happened before the Business was formed, it does not implicate the Business, it is all hearsay, they do not have a valid verifiable claim, and they do not have a witness prepared to testify under oath with firsthand knowledge and information related to the alleged claim, thus, the court is robbed of subject matter jurisdiction.
- 3 **All Motions shall remain void until** the Plaintiffs or their counsel can show why the Defendant, JAMES EDWARD BECKMANN, a Non-Commercial Business formed on April 17, 2017 should be held liable for any alleged prior acts of its authorized representative.
- 4 **All Judges** in this case are hereby given **LEGAL NOTICE** that you are not authorized to do anything on behalf of this Business, JAMES EDWARD BECKMANN, or its Authorized Representative, James Edward Beckmann, except dismiss this case with prejudice and if you do you are **excepting full liability for the consequences**.
- 5 This Business gives **LEGAL DEMAND** that all Judges in this case must operate in your official capacity according to the best of your abilities and understanding, agreeable to the Constitution.
- 6 Under the Lieber Code article 11. The law of war does not only disclaim all cruelty and **bad faith** concerning engagements concluded with the enemy during the war, but also the breaking of stipulations **solemnly contracted** by the belligerents in time of peace, and avowedly intended to **remain in force** in case of war between the contracting powers. It disclaims all extortions and other transactions for individual gain; all acts of private revenge, or connivance at such acts. Offenses to the contrary shall be severely punished and especially so if committed by officers; thus, **The Constitution remains in force**. The Constitution ordained and established September 17, 1787 and implemented March 4, 1789 at Independence Hall Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, at Art. VI, cl.3 provides in pertinent part for the prevention of arbitrary exercise or abuse of "The judicial Power of the United States," id., by way of affirmation to support the Constitution; to wit: "The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the Members of the several States Legislatures, and all Executive and Judicial Officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution;..." Michael H. Simon is a pseudonym and not the man's proper name, He is acting as a United State District Judge, He has failed to produce the required Oath and having taken an amended Oath by striking out 'according to the best of my abilities and understanding, agreeable to the Constitution' and inserting 'under the Constitution', makes Him a **co-conspirators with Congress in an acts of Treason**; therefore, without taking the proper Oath, **He is not operating in good faith, has denied this Business its right to due process of law**, has no judicial authority, produces void judgments and orders, and is proceeding as if this Business has contracted in this case in some way which It has not. Congress had no authority to change the oath of Office he is required to take to hold office. "The Congress as the instrumentality of sovereignty is endowed with certain powers to be exerted on behalf of the people in the manner and with the effect the Constitution ordains. The Congress cannot invoke the sovereign power of the people to override their will as thus declared." Perry v. United States, 294 U.S. 330,353 (1935). The essence of due process of law is Constitutional authority; to wit: 'Due process of law is process according to the law of the land....' "...Due process of law in the latter [the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution] refers to that law of the land which derives its authority from the legislative powers conferred upon Congress by the Constitution of the United States, exercised within the limits therein prescribed and interpreted according to the common law...." Hurtado v. California, 110 U.S. 516, 3 Sup. Ct. 111, 292, 28 L. Ed. 232 (1884).
- 7 This Business has not operated for a profit for its owner, is not a US Citizen, and has no contract with the Plaintiffs, the Plaintiff's counsel, or the UNITED STATES.
- 8 Whenever a Judge is dealing with Federal Rules of Civil Procedures, he becomes a Clerk working for the prosecutor
"...judges who become involved in enforcement of mere statutes (civil or criminal in nature and otherwise), act as mere "clerks" of the involved agency..." K.C. Davis, ADMIN. LAW, Ch. 1 (CTP. West's 1965 Ed.)
"It is the accepted rule, not only in state courts, but, of the federal courts as well, that when a judge is enforcing administrative law they are described as mere 'extensions of the administrative agency for superior reviewing purposes' as a ministerial clerk for an agency..." 30 Cal 596; 167 Cal 762
"When acting to enforce a statute and its subsequent amendments to the present date, the judge of the municipal court is acting as an administrative officer and not in a judicial capacity; courts administering or enforcing statutes do not act judicially, but merely ministerially....but merely act as an extension as an agent for the involved agency – but only

in a “ministerial” and not a “discretionary capacity...” Thompson v. Smith, 154 S.E. 579, 583; Keller v. P.E., 261 US 428; F.R.C. v. G.E., 281, U.S. 464 [emphasis added]

- 9 When a Judge is operating as a Clerk masquerading as a Judge, he cannot do anything judicial, and if he attempts to do anything judicial, it is a nullity
“Ministerial officers are incompetent to receive grants of judicial power from the legislature, their acts in attempting to exercise such powers are necessarily nullities” Burns v. Sup., Ct., SF, 140 Cal. 1
- 10 Once jurisdiction is challenged, it must be proven
“Where a court failed to observe safeguards, it amounts to denial of due process of law, court is deprived of juris.” Merritt v. Hunter, C.A. Kansas 170 F2d 739
“Jurisdiction can be challenged at any time,” and “Jurisdiction, once challenged, cannot be assumed and must be decided.” Basso v. Utah Power & Light Co. 395 F 2d 906, 910
“Defense of lack of jurisdiction over the subject matter may be raised at any time, even on appeal.” Hill Top Developers v. Holiday Pines Service Corp. 478 So. 2D, 368 Fla a DCA 1985)
“Once challenged, jurisdiction cannot be assumed, it must be proved to exist.” Stuck v. Medica1 Examiners 94 Ca 2d 751. 211 P2d 289
“There is no discretion to ignore that lack of jurisdiction.” Joyce v. US, 474 F2d 215
“Where jurisdiction is contested, the burden of establishing it rests upon the plaintiff.” Loos v American Energy Savers, Inc., 168 I11.App.3d 558, 522 N.E.2d 841(1988)
“the burden of proving jurisdiction rests upon the party asserting it.” Bindell v City of Harvey, 212 I11.App.3d 1042, 571 N.E.2d 1017(1st Dist. 1991)
“Court must prove on the record, all jurisdiction facts related to the jurisdiction asserted.” Lantana v. Hopper, 102 F. 2d 188; Chicago v. New York 37 F.Supp. 150
- 11 In order to prove jurisdiction there MUST be a contract
“It is impossible to prove jurisdiction exists absent a substantial nexus with the state, such as voluntary subscription to license. All jurisdictional facts supporting claim that supposed jurisdiction exists must appear on the record of the court.” Pipe Line v Marathon. 102 S. Ct. 3858 quoting Crowell v Benson 883 US 22
- 12 No corporation has standing to do anything in any court
“My opinion is and long has been that the mayor and aldermen of a city corporation, or the president and directors of a bank, or the president and directors of a railroad company and of other similar corporations, are the true parties that sue and are sued as trustees and representatives of the constantly changing stockholders.... A corporation, therefore, being not a natural person, but a mere creature of the mind, invisible and intangible, cannot be a citizen of a state, or of the United States, and cannot fall within the terms or the power of the above mentioned article, and can therefore neither plead nor be impleaded in the courts of the United States.” Rundle v Delaware & Raritan Canal Company 55 U.S. 80 (1852) [emphasis added]
- 13 The Judges in this case are NOT acting in their official capacity, but were all acting in their private capacity ONLY.
“A judge ceases to set as a judicial officer because the governing principals of administrative law provides that courts are prohibited from substituting their evidence, testimony, record, arguments and rationale for that of the agency. Additionally, courts are prohibited from their substituting their judgments for that of the agency.” AISI v US, 568 F2d 284.
“An officer who acts in violation of the Constitution ceases to represent the government”. Brookfield Const. Co. v. Stewart, 284 F. Supp. 94.
- 14 The Judges in this case are clerk masquerading as a Judge committing treason and pursuant to your federal codes **“When a judge acts where he or she does not have jurisdiction to act, the judge is engaged in an act or acts of treason.”** US v Will, 449 US 200,216, 101 S Ct, 471, 66 LEd2nd 392, 406 (1980) Cohens V Virginia, 19 US (6 Wheat) 264, 404, 5LEd 257 (1821)
“An unconstitutional act is not law; it confers no rights; it imposes no duties; affords no protection; it creates no office; it is in legal contemplation, as inoperative as though it had never been passed.” Norton vs Shelby County, 118 U.S. 425, p. 442
“An unconstitutional law is void, and is as no law. An offence created by it is not a crime.” Ex parte Siebold, 100 U.S. 371, 376 (1880), quoted with approval in Fay v. Noia, 372 U.S. 391, 408 (1963)



"No one is bound to obey an unconstitutional law and no courts are bound to enforce it."
16th American Jurisprudence 2d, Section 177 late 2nd, Section 256

- 15 When a Judge in this case becomes a Clerk Masquerading as a Judge, he walks away from any immunity he may enjoy, and becomes personally liable **"Judge loses his absolute immunity from damage actions only when he acts in clear absence of all jurisdiction or performance of an act which is not judicial in nature."** Schucker v. Rockwood, 846 F.2d 1202

"When enforcing mere statutes, judges of all courts do not act judicially" and thus are not protected by "qualified" or "limited immunity," SEE: Owen v. City, 445 U.S. 662; Bothke v. Terry, 713 F2d 1404

- 16 The decision in this kangaroo so-called court is brutum fulmen
"brutum fulmen": "An empty noise; an empty threat. A judgment void upon its face which is in legal effect no judgment at all, and by which no rights are divested, and from which none can be obtained; and neither binds nor bars anyone. Dollert v. Pratt-Hewitt Oil Corporation, Tex.Civ.Appl, 179 S.W.2d 346, 348. Also, see Corpus Juris Secundum, "Judgments" §§ 499, 512 546, 549. Black's Law Dictionary, 4th Edition.

- 17 Under the color of their so-called law

"Color" means "An appearance, semblance, or simulacrum, as distinguished from that which is real. A prima facie or apparent right. Hence, a deceptive appearance, a plausible, assumed exterior, concealing a lack of reality; a disguise or pretext. See also colorable."
Black's Law Dictionary, 5th Edition, on page 240.

"Colour, color. Signifies a probable plea, but which is in fact false..." Tomlin's Law Dictionary 1835, Volume 1

"Colorable" means "That which is in appearance only, and not in reality, what it purports to be, hence counterfeit feigned, having the appearance of truth." Windle v. Flinn, 196 Or. 654, 251 P.2d 136, 146.

"Colour of Law – Mere semblance of a legal right. An action done under colour of law is one done with the apparent authority of law but actually in contravention of law." Barron's Dictionary of Canadian Law, Sixth Edition, page 51,

"Color of Law" means "The appearance or semblance, without the substance, of legal right. Misuse of power, possessed by virtue of state law and made possible only because wrongdoer is clothed with authority of state is action taken under 'color of law.'"
Atkins v. Lanning. D.C.Okla., 415 F. Supp. 186, 188.

- 18 The Clerk masquerading as a Judge knows that it is my right to have a neutral and detached judge, but instead chose to conspire with Vogel and Pippins and thereby participate in a fraud and a nullity;

a. The Judge presented himself as neutral and unbiased when in actuality was bought and paid for by their handler in England, Elizabeth Windsor

"It is a fundamental right of a party to have a neutral and detached judge preside over the judicial proceedings." Ward v Village of Monroeville, 409 U.S. 57, 61-62, 93 S.Ct 80, 83, 34 L.Ed. 2d 267 (1972); Tumey v Ohio, 273 U.S. 510, 5209, 47 S. Ct. 437, 440, 71 L.Ed. 749 (1927)

b. Judges in this case know that King George signed the Definitive Treaty of Peace of 1783 as the King of England and France, and the Arch Treasurer and Prince Elector of the Holy Roman Empire and of the United States of America, and Queen Elizabeth is the successor to King George, therefore they are taking orders from that bitch in England (no disrespect to dogs intended), and the Satanist POPE, Inc, in the Vatican, and conspired with these PIGs named herein, in a seditious conspiracy to the Constitution for the United States of America in violation of their own federal codes.

c. They assaulted the Defendant with their corporate codes and statutes and the Defendant has served hundreds of documents on them and their superiors stating that the Defendant is not interested in participating in their satanic commercial transactions, and they are their accomplice

d. They assaulted the Defendant with their criminal corporation

"My opinion is and long has been that the mayor and aldermen of a city corporation, or the president and directors of a bank, or the president and directors of a railroad company and of other similar corporations, are the true parties that sue and are sued as trustees and representatives of the constantly changing stockholders.... A corporation, therefore, being not a natural person, but a mere creature of the mind, invisible and intangible, cannot be a citizen of a state, or of the United States, and cannot fall within the terms or the power of the above mentioned article, and can therefore neither plead nor be impleaded in the courts of



the United States." Rundle v Delaware & Raritan Canal Company 55 U.S. 80 (1852) [emphasis added]

- 19 For all of the foregoing reasons, all of the ORDERS, Judgments, and decisions, in this case, are absolute nullities and void ab initio

"Where there is no jurisdiction there is no judge; the proceeding is as nothing. Such has been the law from the days of the Marshalsea, 10 Coke 68; also Bradley v. Fisher, 13 Wall 335,351." Manning v. Ketcham, 58 F.2d 948.

"A void judgment is one which, from its inception, was a complete nullity and without legal effect" Lubben v. Selective Service System Local Bd. No. 27, 453 F.2d 645, 14 A.L.R. Fed. 298 (C.A. 1 Mass. 1972). Hobbs v. U.S. Office of Personnel Management, 485 F.Supp. 456 (M.D. Fla. 1980).

"Void judgment is one which has no legal force or effect whatever, it is an absolute nullity, its invalidity may be asserted by any person whose rights are affected at any time and at any place and it need not be attacked directly but may be attacked collaterally whenever and wherever it is interposed." City of Lufkin v. McVicker, 510 S.W. 2d 141 (Tex. Civ. App. – Beaumont 1973).

"A void judgment, insofar as it purports to be pronouncement of court, is an absolute nullity" Thompson v. Thompson, 238 S.W.2d 218 (Tex.Civ.App. – Waco 1951).

"Void order may be attacked, either directly or collaterally, at any time" In re Estate of Steinfeld, 630 N.E.2d 801, certiorari denied, See also Steinfeld v. Hoddick, 513 U.S. 809, (Ill. 1994).

"A void judgment is one which, from its inception, is and forever continues to be absolutely null, without legal efficacy, ineffectual to bind the parties or to support a right, of no legal force and effect whatever, and incapable of enforcement in any manner or to any degree." Loyd v. Director, Dept. of Public Safety, 480 So. 2d 577 (Ala. Civ. App. 1985).

"Not every action by any judge is in exercise of his judicial function. It is not a judicial function for a Judge to commit an intentional tort even though the tort occurs in the Courthouse, when a judge acts as a Trespasser of the Law, when a judge does not follow the law, the judge loses subject matter jurisdiction and The Judge's orders are void, of no legal force or effect!" Yates Vs. Village of Hoffman Estates, Illinois, 209 F.Supp. 757 (N.D. Ill. 1962) and all such judgments and ORDERS are brutum fulmen

"brutum fulmen": "An empty noise; an empty threat. A judgment void upon its face which is in legal effect no judgment at all, and by which no rights are divested, and from which none can be obtained; and neither binds nor bars anyone. Dollert v. Pratt-Hewitt Oil Corporation, Tex.Civ.Appl, 179 S.W.2d 346, 348. Also, see Corpus Juris Secundum, "Judgments" §§ 499, 512 546, 549. Black's Law Dictionary, 4th Edition

- 20 Judges in this case intended to be a bought and paid for Clerks masquerading as a Judge held a show-trial in his kangaroo court

"Kangaroo court. Term descriptive of a sham legal proceeding in which a person's rights are totally disregarded and in which the result is a foregone conclusion because of the bias of the court or other tribunal." Black's Law Dictionary, 6th Edition, page 868,

- 21 They intend to perjure their oaths."

- 22 Everything they do is a fraud

"Once a fraud, always a fraud." 13 Vin. Abr. 539.

"Things invalid from the beginning cannot be made valid by subsequent act." Trayner, Max. 482. Maxims of Law, Black's Law Dictionary 9th Edition, page 1862

"A thing void in the beginning does not become valid by lapse of time." 1 S. & R. 58. Maxims of Law, Black's Law Dictionary 9th Edition, page 1866

Time cannot render valid an act void in its origin. Dig. 50, 17, 29; Broom, Max. 178, Maxims of Law, Black's Law Dictionary 9th Edition, page 1862,

"Ex dolo malo non oritur action. Out of fraud no action arises. Cowper, 343; Broom's Max. 349." Bouvier's Maxims of Law, 1856,

and any act by any government official, to conceal the fraud becomes an act of fraud;

"fraus est celare fraudem. It is a fraud to conceal a fraud. 1 Vern. 270." Bouvier's Maxims of Law 1856

and fraud is inexcusable and unpardonable;

"Fraus et dolus nemini patrocinari debent. Fraud and deceit should excuse no man. 3 Co. 78." Bouvier's Maxims of Law 1856



and any fraud amounts to injustice;

"Fraus et jus nunquam cohabitant. Fraud and justice never dwell together." Maxims of Law, Black's Law Dictionary, 9th Edition, page 1832

"Quod alias bonum et justum est, si per vim vel fraudem petatur, malum et injustum efficitur. What is otherwise good and just, if sought by force or fraud, becomes bad and unjust. 3 Co. 78." Bouvier's Maxims of Law, 1856

"Fraud and deceit may arise from silence where there is a duty to speak the truth, as well as from speaking an untruth." Morrison v Acton, 198 P.2d 590, 68 Ariz. 27 (1948)

"Fraud" may be committed by a failure to speak when the duty of speaking is imposed as much as by speaking falsely." Batty v Arizona State Dental Board, 112 P.2d 870, 57 Ariz. 239. (1941).

"Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it." John 8:44

and their judgment day is coming

"...I know the blasphemy of them which say they are Jews, [or Christians] and are not, but are the synagogue of Satan." Revelations 2:9

"But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers [pharmaceutical drug pushers], and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death." Revelations 21:8

23 This Declaration is sealed pursuant to locus sigilli

"locus sigilli - The place of the seal. Today this phrase is almost always abbreviated "L.S." " Black's Law Dictionary 9th Edition, page 1026.

Signed and sealed in red ink on the land, under penalties with perjury.

I, James Edward Beckmann, Authorized Representative, Sui Juris, a natural man of the republic, living in the republic, a common man, does declare that I have scribed and read the foregoing facts, and in accordance with the best of my firsthand knowledge, such are true, correct, complete and not misleading, the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, before God, Angels, and everybody who reads this document as witnesses, and pursuant to your rules of evidence.

This Declaration is dated this Twelfth day of November in the year, two thousand and Seventeen.

James Edward Beckmann L. S.
Authorized Representative James Edward Beckmann, sui juris
sovereign living soul, holder of the office of "the people"
Judicial Power Citizen by right of blood
a man, Inhabitant of the land
With full responsibility for My actions
under YHWH's law as found in the Holy Bible and no other

<u>Name</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Signature</u>
<u>Ken Summers</u>	<u>Newberg, OR</u>	<u><i>[Signature]</i></u>
<u>Clayton Dawson</u>	<u>Newberg, Oregon</u>	<u><i>[Signature]</i></u>
<u>Susan Dawson</u>	<u>Newberg, OR</u>	<u><i>[Signature]</i></u>
<u>Daniel Kassam</u>	<u>Newberg, Oregon</u>	<u><i>[Signature]</i></u>
<u>Victor Duran</u>	<u>Newberg, OR</u>	<u><i>[Signature]</i></u>

